



Wednesday, August 19, 2015 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Conference Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

- Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
- Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
- Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
- Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
- Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
- Kate Pack, First 5
- Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
- Megan Sirna, Human Services Department
- Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
- Rebecca Wachsberg, County Administrator's Office

- Rob Halverson, Probation Department
- Serena Lienau, Violence Prevention Partnership

Staff (listed alphabetically)

- Allegra Wilson, Human Services Department
- Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department
- Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

- B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting

Public (listed alphabetically)

- Leah Benz, First 5

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions. Motion to approve the minutes with corrections: Serena and Rebecca were listed twice.	Motion to approve the minutes: Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
Updates & Reports	<p>Angie provided an update of Technical Assistance since the last meeting. There were 8 new programs approved for the Portfolio since the last meeting. Tier 1: Coping Cat and Triple P; Tier 2: Court Appointed Special Advocates, Reach out and Read, Safe School Ambassadors and The Council; Tier 3: 2-1-1 and Neighborhood Listening Project. There are close to 100 programs on the Portfolio and staff is considering ways to celebrate when that number is reached.</p> <p>One goal for this year is to have a revamped, searchable online database to assist funders and donors in finding programs of interest to them. Upstream staff is also willing to assist when calls from funders and donors are received. The Portfolio will also be organized by Health Action categories: health, economic wellness, and education.</p>	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Measurement Tools Pilot Application- Action Item	<p>Protective Factors Survey, CPI Reviewers: All present Recusals : None</p> <p>This is the first Measurement Tool application and it is being used as a pilot. Angie shared the California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse website and their section on Measurement Tools.</p> <p>Kate provided background information on the Protective Factors Survey and why having it on the Portfolio would be useful. The tool is designed to look at aggregate data on resiliency in families. Encouraging agencies to use the same tool bolsters collective impact by providing shared measurements.</p> <p>The committee was given five minutes to read through the application with the scoring sheet.</p> <p>Discussion: Is it appropriate for the Portfolio Review Committee to review and approve measurement and assessment tools?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some on the committee felt that adding measurement tools to the Portfolio adds confusion to the process and could devalue the work of the Portfolio. • The group would prefer that shared measurement tools be included and recommended on the website and recommended through the Technical Assistance process. 	<p>Motion to have Technical Assistance integrate information and encourage programs to use evidence based assessment tools:</p> <p>Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>Staff will reconvene with CPI and discuss different approaches to further shared measurement within the community.</p>
Tier 1 and Measurement Tool Clearinghouse Review- Action Item	<p>Joni shared the Stanford Patient Education Research Center and led a discussion about including it as a Tier 1 Clearinghouse. All of Stanford’s programs are small-group self-management programs in English and Spanish. License purchase and training are requirements for organizations to implement the programs and be listed by the clearinghouse. An implementer would need to complete a fidelity chart and be listed on Stanford Patient Education Research Center’s website. The programs have outside evaluation and are peer reviewed.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stanford only lists its own programs in its clearinghouse, and so it may not be neutral in the same way as a traditional clearinghouse. • Karin would like a recommendation from the Clearinghouse Review Workgroup or 	<p>None.</p>	<p>Staff will do more research on the Stanford Patient Education Research Center as a clearinghouse and on the definition of a clearinghouse. The clearinghouse and the larger issue of clearinghouse</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joni stated that the programs listed on the Stanford Patient Education Research Center meet Tier 1 criteria. 		approval will be revisited.
<p>Tier 2 Application and Renewal Forms- Action Item</p>	<p>The Committee reviewed staff recommendations for Tier 2 application and renewal forms. Joni shared the current language and let the committee know that staff encourages and anticipates revisions.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Tier 2 Scoring Sheet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Change “for reapplication” to “in short-term” in 2e. ○ Add “Local” before “Outcomes” in 2e. • Renewal Tier 2 Scoring Sheet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Remove “short-term” from 5. ○ Change 6 to “Are the outcomes acceptable?” ○ Change 7 to ask about methods and analysis. ○ Both 5 and 6 are required elements. ○ Reword “Complete the following only if the submitted evaluation does not include local outcomes.” 	None	Staff will bring an updated draft of the Tier 2 application and renewal forms to the next meeting.
<p>Public Comment</p>	None	None	None
<p>Next Meeting/Final Comments</p>	The next meeting will be held on September 16, 2015.	None	None
<p>Adjourn</p>	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None